HN

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,351	10/19/2000	Thomas Anthony Gregg	AUS9-2000-0628-US1	6897

35525 7590 06/15/2005

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/692,351	GREGG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 April 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *02/22/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are presented for examination.

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 02/22/2005 was filed after the mailing date of the office action on 01/14/2005. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah et al. (6,694,361) (hereinafter Shah) in view of "Official Notice".

5. AS per claims 1, 9, and 17, Shah discloses a method, program and system for routing data packets to multiple partitions (partition manager, col 7, lines 37-41) within a single end node, comprising:

assigning a range of local identification addresses (LIDs) to a channel adapter port an end node (elements, fig 6, col 8, lines 42-51); and assigning value (col 10, lines 49-54) within the local identification addresses to specify which of several partitions within the end node is being addressed (each port can be uniquely identified, col 8, lines 42-51). Shah, however, does not explicitly discloses assigning bits within the LIDS. "Official Notice " is taken that the concept of control bit masking is well known in the art. One of the ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that creating a control mask and assigning LIDS to the bits (an arrangement of bits in a word or register that assigns logical significance to corresponding bits in other words) would need optimize processing and the routing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Shah with well known concept of bit masking and assigning bits to channels. The motivation would have been assigning mapping lids with bits for optimal routing path finding.

6. As per claims 2, and 10, claims are rejected for the similar reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Shah discloses the bits are lower order bits (col 10, lines 49-54).

7. As per claims 3, 11, and 18, Shah discloses the channel adapter port is connected to a system area network (624, fig 6).

8. As per claims 4, 12, and 19, Shah discloses the network contains two raised to the N power end nodes, switches, and routers (fig 6); and

the number of bits in local identification address equals N (cluster, fig 6, col 24-40).

9. As per claims 5, 13, and 20, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. Shah discloses the lower order bits assigned to partitions are designated by a local identification mask control (LMC) field (multiple of 16, col 10, lines 49-54).

10. As per claims 6, 14, and 21, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. Shah discloses the local identification mask control can be any number of bits (multiple of 16, col 10, lines 49-54).

11. As per claims 7, 15, and 22, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. Shah discloses the number of lower order bits assigned to addressing within a port is up to two raised to the local identification mask control power (multiple of 16, col 10, lines 49-54).

12. As per claims 8, 16, and 23, Shah discloses the different local identification addresses of a port identify different partitions (col 8, lines 42-51).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 04/14/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, therefore rejections to claims 1-23 is maintained.

14. In the remarks applicants argued that:

Argument: Shah does not teach routing multiple packets to partitions.

Response: Examiner respect fully disagrees, Shah teaches routing data packets (col 3, lines 15-20, routing data from source to a target node) to multiple partitions (partition manager that assigns partition keys anticipates partition manager assigning key to partitions, col 7, lines 37-41) within a single end node (col 3, lines 15-20 and col 7, lines 37-41).

Argument: Shah does not teach assigning a range of LIDS to a port.

Response: Examiner respect fully disagrees, Shah teaches assigning a range of local identification addresses (LIDs) (col 8, lines 42-45, assigning unique addresses to fabric-attached ports, unique addresses must include range) to a channel adapter port an end node (elements, fig 6, col 8, lines 42-51).

Argument: Shah does not teach assigning bits within the LIDS.

Response: Examiner respect fully disagrees, Shah teaches assigning value (the smallest unit of information a computer can use. A bit is represented as a "0" or a "1", and these are the binary value of the bit, value 16 represents 4 bits, col 10, lines 45-54, LID stride value is a tunable parameter of LID) within the local identification addresses to specify which of several partitions within the end node is being addressed (each port can be uniquely identified, col 8, lines 42-51, the concept of control bit masking is well known in the art. One of the ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that creating a control mask and assigning LIDS to the bits (an arrangement of bits in a word or register that assigns logical significance to corresponding bits in other words) would need optimize processing and the routing. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use the well known concept of bit masking and assigning bits to channels.

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100